

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/660,624	MASUI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas A. Morrison	3653	

All Participants:

(1) Thomas A. Morrison.

(2) _____.

Status of Application: _____

(3) Mr. Lawrence Stahl (Reg. No. 30,110).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 October 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1, 4, 5 and 8

Prior art documents discussed:

None


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 DONALD P. VALSKY
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Contacted Mr. Stahl (applicant's representative) to get approval for minor change to the specification and claims 4 and 5 on about 10/25/05. Mr. Stahl approved such changes during the telephone call. In particular, "has" in claims 4 and 5 was changed to -- have --. Also, clarification was made to the specification as to the driving portion set forth in claim 1. Called Mr. Stahl again on 10/31/05 to get approval to change occurrences of "the sheet" to -- the sheets -- in claim 8 for consistency in the claim language. Also pointed out that the change to the specification at page 6, line 26 to page 7, line 14 in applicant's April 28, 2005 amendment will not be entered, because the text that applicant wanted to change does not match up with the text in the specification at this location. On the other hand, it was agreed to make the same change at the proper location in the specification by examiner's amendment (copy attached). Mr. Stahl approved such changes on 10/31/05. The changes were discussed with a primary examiner or an SPE.